Dear Paul,

3/17/04

There are several things of interest in your 3 MAR 1. And what I regard as a few booby-traps, some old.

Re: sprocket-hole material in Zapruder, there is nothing new in this unless it is in frames not published by the Commission. There is no doubt that the old sprocket-hole material is of evidentiary value. (WW II). Groden may well have the frames after 334 in mind. The Archives has to end including 343 and I think, as best I can remember my examination of them, that there is significant evidence in them not congenial to some of Groden's theorizing as well as that of others. For example, views of the back of JFK's head showing no blood at all and none trickled down.

Before any serious attention can be paid to Lifton's theory, it first must be established that his theory is tenable. This means that all the prerequisites it requires must be real, not merely more of his theorizing. He cannot theorize the minimum basic conditions and facts it requires as its basis. You and others have ignored them, and to the best of my knowledge, nobody, including Lifton has attempted to refute what I've said about them. I'll give you an example because it is one I mentioned to him and he gave me his "explanation." His detailed time reconstructions allowed no time for the taking of the pictures and X-rays that were taken before the corpse was cut at all in the autopsy. I asked him about this and he replied that there was plenty of time because the autopsy itself did not begin until, I'm not sure of which) 10:30. (He may have said 10, but no earlier. I asked him how he came to that conclusion? He cited Dr. Ebersole as his source, Dr. Ebersole told him that. Aside from all else that we know is wrong about theorizing that the autopsy began that late, we also have credible reason to believe that we know when the cutting up stopped, and that time makes what we know was done impossible. We also actually know when it began, from the very sources he cites. There are many other things, beginning in Dallas, that in each and ~~xxx~~ every instance must be true before anything else is credited and they are not true. Any theory that avoids what is uncongenial can be made attractive and persuasive but that does not make it true, reasonable or even minimally responsible.

If you are going to continue your search under FOIA for information related to what you refer to as the return of the body, including logs or transcripts of communications to and from AF1, the CIA was not the best agency to ask. Ask both the military and the White House, the latter in different ways. All the early stuff, beginning with the doctors' press conference, is at the LBJ library as part of his administration. The White House also has its own communications room and its own details from the military, such as relating to the helicopters and the planes.

19 I'd like to see, please, because of what you note of the new stench of the Epsteinkery. He has become an official apologist, going back to Garrison's day and conspicuously in his anti-black writing. His shift to Castro did it coincides with the efforts of the Reagan administration to heat up Cuban matters.

With regard to Schorr, why do you believe that what you quote comes from a real source? Danny's not about to do that kind of work. He, too, is theorizing and he, too, just makes it up as he goes, without regard to fact. (I sent him and Wicker both copies of what I wrote and both remain silent.)

While in a somewhat different formulation it is quite reasonable to wonder if "Oswald knew he had a role in something," his use of "patsy" to describe himself does not mean that. It means no more than that he was set up or framed or that it had been contrived by others to make him appear to be involved or guilty.

If there is any one thing that helps the official story survive inside the government it is the ease with which the many theories are put down. It is both irresponsible and hurtful to present them as factual when none has any factual basis. Best,